

under which longer hours may be compelled. If it is said that such legislation robs the employe of independence in the matter of contract, it may be replied that there is as little independence in such matters, as there is in the fixing of the rate of interest. Solomon's declaration that the "borrower is servant unto the lender," stands good today and justifies usury laws. The employe of a great corporation is no less a servant unto the employer in the matter of hours, and it is for his protection that the maximum hours are fixed, as usury laws are fixed for the protection of the borrower. The home has claims which legislation must recognize. The home is the unit, the center of moral strength and health. Society can not tolerate a condition under which the husband and father is denied the strength which home life imparts, nor can the home be robbed, with impunity, of his presence and influence.

Citizenship, too, has claims that can not be ignored. If the laboring man is to be a voter, he must be allowed time to prepare himself for the discharge of the responsible duties that come with citizenship. The state needs both his judgment and his conscience, and it can hardly expect either if he is driven from his bed to his work and from his work back to his bed again, with no time for study, for reflection and for conference with his fellows.

#### WOMAN AND CHILD LABOR

If legislation is necessary to protect the adult man, it is much more necessary to protect women and children. Investigations have sometimes disclosed conditions which can not be described in parliamentary language—can not be recited without emotion. You will be sustained by your constituents if you authorize legislation which will make it impossible for women to be employed under conditions hurtful to health or that menace their social and moral welfare. You will be sustained, also, if you authorize legislation which will protect children from labor in factory or mine during the period when they ought to be in school, and from all kinds of employment that will stunt their development. There is no darker page in our industrial history than that which records indifference to the welfare of children—the coining of dividends out of child-blood, the darkening of the prospects of a rising generation and the impoverishment of posterity.

I offer apologies for having trespassed so long upon your time, although I have, by no means, covered all the subjects with which you will be called upon to deal. I can only offer in my defense an intense interest in the work in which you are engaged and a sincere desire to acknowledge the compliment implied in your invitation by presenting such observations as I hope may be useful to you in framing an organic law for your commonwealth. I indulge in the hope that your conclusions will be so satisfactory to your constituents that your names will be cherished by a grateful people and that this law, which the people write through you, will be worthy to endure until changed conditions compel new interpretations of the popular will.

#### "PROGRESSIVENESS" WITHOUT PROGRESS

President Taft claims to be a progressive—it is a confession that progressiveness is popular—and launches this paraphrase: "Progressive is as progressive does." Is he willing to be measured by that standard? Does he doubt that the people of the United States demand the election of senators by direct vote? Why has he been so late in recognizing the demand? In 1908 he said that PERSONALLY he was INCLINED to favor it—that was after congress had declared for it five times, after nearly two-thirds of the states had indorsed it and after it had been included in three national platforms of the democratic party? What has he done since to help the people secure this great reform? Nothing. If "progressive does" how old will Ann be before Mr. Taft progresses as far on this question as the democratic party was nineteen years ago.

We have a law compelling the publication, before the election, of the names of contributors to the national campaign fund. The principle had no opposition in the senate or house. This is a progressive measure. What was the president's part? He never said a word in behalf of the measure and when he signed the bill he was aware that if he did not sign the bill it would be passed over his veto. What evidence of progressiveness did he give in this matter? And where does he stand on the income tax? He urged the submission of the amendment in order to defeat a statutory income tax—he did it at the solicitation of Senator Aldrich and he has not in his travels urged

ratification but has, on the contrary, elevated to the supreme bench Governor Hughes who asked the New York legislature to refuse to ratify. What progressiveness did he show here?

These three great reforms will characterize his administration—one already secured and two more in sight—but he will have no part in them. What a record! It is without a parallel. He spends so much time qualifying, explaining and hair splitting on the capacity of the people for self-government that he has no time left—nor disposition—to assist the people to secure a larger and more effective control over the instrumentalities of government.

If two negatives always made an affirmative, Mr. Taft ought by this time to be able to reach several affirmatives—but they do not and he does not.

## Roosevelt's Candidacy

Yes, Mr. Roosevelt is a candidate—we have suspected it for some time but he promised to speak when he thought the time proper for speaking, so we waited. That third cup of coffee which the Outlook discussed so sagely made it quite certain that the announcement was coming and now we have it. He will accept it, if the people want him—and of course he would not have anything to accept if they do not.

The Commoner has already recorded its opposition to a third term but that is not the only objection the democrats will find to his candidacy. He is wrong on several questions and where right is only following where democrats have led. He is years behind progressive democrats—why should the people violate the precedent of a century and give him a third term to reward him for advocating reforms which democrats advocated not only before him but against his opposition. But it is a great gain to our party to have Mr. Roosevelt bring such an indictment against President Taft as he does when he becomes a candidate against him. To say that Mr. Taft who came in with a popular majority of more than a million can not be re-elected is to confess the failure of his administration. Mr. Roosevelt guaranteed Mr. Taft in the last campaign. As a guarantor can not be called upon except when the principal is insolvent Mr. Roosevelt's offer to take Mr. Taft's place is virtually a declaration that the president is politically bankrupt. No matter which way the contest between the president and ex-president goes the democrats ought to win—and they will if they nominate a candidate in whom the progressives of the country have confidence—and run him upon a platform really democratic.

#### WHO IS FOOLED?

When you see good men supporting a candidate whom Wall street is urging, you know that SOMEBODY is making a mistake; and you may wonder who it is, but really there is no need for wonder or uncertainty. You ought to know that Wall street makes no such mistakes. It is Wall street's business to know whom it can trust. It can not afford to take any chances—and does not take any. When, for instance, the stock exchange records its democratic members as overwhelmingly for Harmon, why should any progressive democrat be for him? When Jim Hill, who has fought the democratic party whenever it has been progressive and has stood ready to finance the campaign if the party would only accept reactionary leadership—when Jim Hill urges the nomination of Governor Harmon why should any progressive support him? A man may be deceived by others—but why should he deceive himself? A progressive democrat must close his eyes and ears and chloroform his mind before he can excuse himself for supporting Governor Harmon.

Congressman Campbell of Kansas has at least formed a conclusive (?) opinion against the recall—namely, the demand of the mob for the crucifixion of Christ. Kansas must be proud of an intellect that can not distinguish between an orderly election and a mob. He should read his Bible more closely and he will find that it was "the common people" who heard Christ gladly.

Ex-Senator Foraker opposes the initiative and referendum because of the expense. Too bad; but why not consider the cause of the demand for the initiative and referendum? It was because the people found that boss rule costs them more in one year than the initiative and referendum would in ten. It is wise economy.

## An Incomplete Platform

Below will be found an abstract of the Missouri democratic platform, adopted a few days ago by the convention that presented Speaker Clark's name to the democrats of the nation. The abstract is taken from the Brookfield (Mo.) Argus:

"The history of the republican party is a tale of broken promises.

"It destroyed popular government in the house of representatives by a system of rules which vested arbitrary power in the speaker.

"It inaugurated a system of wasteful extravagances unparalleled in history.

"It created a tariff law which imposes a tax upon the necessities of life for the benefit of favored institutions.

"It not only permitted the establishment of monopoly, but gave executive sanction to the destruction by the greatest trust on earth of its last potential rival.

"It is responsible for the existence of that vast system of combination which has raised the prices of living to a point where the cost of the very necessities of life is almost beyond reach of the great industrial classes.

"The republican party came before the people at the last national election promising to reform its own iniquities. In violation of the pledge it enacted the Payne-Aldrich Tariff.

"Declaring the most important schedule of this bill to be utterly indefensible, the president, nevertheless, signed the measure and gave it the force of law.

"The democratic party, under the splendid leadership of Champ Clark, overthrew 'Cannonism' and restored the representative government of the popular branch of congress.

"A bill was passed reducing the tariff tax upon woolen goods.

"In response to the demands of the monopolies and other great protected industries, President Taft vetoed all these measures of reform.

"We commend and indorse the splendid work done by the democrats of the house and senate.

"We particularly express our admiration for the leadership of Speaker Clark.

"We congratulate the democrats of Missouri upon the splendid record and faithful services of our democratic state officials.

"The interests of our state demand that our great waterways should be improved so that commerce may be restored to our rivers. We insist that these improvements should be so as to protect the rich bottom lands contiguous to those navigable floods.

"We are opposed to any system which brings into competition with honest labor the products manufactured by convicts. We favor home rule for the cities and communities of the state.

"We therefore, in presenting the name of the great progressive democrat, Champ Clark, hereby direct and specifically instruct the delegates elected by this convention to the national democratic convention, to be held in Baltimore, Md., June 25, 1912, to work and vote for Champ Clark as a unit, continuously, to the end, that he may be made the nominee of said democratic national convention for president of the United States."

Progressive democrats will read the above with disappointment—it does not cover the ground. It is painfully incomplete. Speaker Clark owes it to the democrats of the nation to supplement it and bring it up to date. Denunciation of the republican party is not sufficient. We must stand affirmatively for what the people need. "Viewing with alarm" and "pointing with pride" used to do, but something more specific is demanded now. The Missouri platform does not indorse the Denver platform—has it been abandoned?

The platform says nothing about the trust question—unless inaction on the subject is commended as a part of the "splendid work" indorsed in the platform. The trust question can not be ignored so easily—it must have attention and our democratic congress should hasten to redeem the party pledge on that subject. There are some other subjects that deserve consideration. Mr. Clark's appeal is to progressives—none of his literature is intended for the reactionaries. He should hasten to announce his views on the subjects ignored by the platform of his state.

So ex-Congressman Caldwell wants to be governor of Illinois, does he? And he thinks he can win a nomination in a democratic primary? How little he knows of the progressive movement now sweeping over the country. He ought to have run when Wall street was in control and before the people discovered the menace and the methods of the Money trust. If the democrats of Illinois really want a plutocrat for governor why not get Rockefeller, Morgan or Carnegie? Why take a small imitation?

Ex-President Roosevelt has brought President Taft face to face with an embarrassing choice. The president must favor a primary and risk being defeated for the nomination, or he must refuse it and risk being defeated for election because he was afraid to trust the voters of his own party. Bad either way.

When Mr. Roosevelt goes out to plead for a third term the people will understand his willingness to ACCEPT if the people DEMAND his nomination.